REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1 - 19 stand rejected. Claims 1-2, 4-5 and 4-19 have been amended to effect a better understanding of the claims.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-19 were rejected by the Examiner as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the rejections were based on the use of the word "static", as it was employed in the claims.

The invention recited in the claims provides a way to automatically control the compensation for a control system. This is done by combining a statically compensated control loop with a dynamically compensated control loop. This unique combination frees a user from the necessity of fixed compensation settings and automatically adjusts the compensation to minimize manual input and errors. The claims and specification have been amended to explain the static and dynamic compensation features more clearly. No new matter has been added.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action identified rejections to claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 13, 14, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Takenaka (U.S. Patent No. 5504452).

Takenaka discloses a single loop control circuit to maintain a desired voltage inside an integrated circuit. Basically, a voltage divider in the form of an MOS transistor 12 provides a desired output voltage Vdd for application to an internal node. A voltage comparison circuit 13 (including RC elements 24 and 26) monitors Vdd and compares it to a reference voltage. The output of the monitoring circuit is fed to a control circuit 16. When Vdd drops below a threshold level, the control circuit activates switch 15 to supplement the voltage at Vdd, thereby completing the single control loop.

It is well known that anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. In re Robertson, 169 F.3d 743, 49 U.S.P.Q.2d 1949 (Fed. Cir. 1999)(*reversing Board of Patent Appeals & Interference's finding of anticipation under §102*).

In contrast to Takanaka's circuit, the circuit of claim 1 employs a first control loop that has a static level of linear compensation, and a second control loop capable of providing a dynamically changing level of compensation. Takenaka does not disclose nor remotely suggest any form of changing compensation for his circuit. Moreover, the reference teaches the use of a single control loop while claim 1 recites first and second control loops. These features distinguish claim 1 over Takenaka. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 8, 10, and 17 include elements similar to those claimed in claim 1, and for the same reasons are believed patentable over Takenaka. Likewise, because claims 4, 5, 13, 14 and 18 depend directly and/or indirectly from claims 1, 8, 10 and 17, those claims are also believed allowable.

Applicants submit that all of the amendments and remarks set forth above place the claims in condition for allowance, and early notice thereof is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted

Lance M. Kreisman
Reg. 39,256
Attorney for Applicants

Atty. Docket: 1495-US
phone: (818) 874-7026
fax: (818) 874-5626